

RECEIVED

FEB 01 2000

21 MS. KRISTIN LEMS: Hello. I am Kristin Lems  
22 from Evanston, Illinois. I teach at National  
23 Lewis University where I am an associate  
24 professor. My main connection to nuclear power  
1 has been the poor immigrants from Belarus and  
2 Ukraine that I have met who have had family  
3 members die as short-term and long-term results  
4 of the Chernobyl catastrophe.

1 5 I appreciate the fact that the  
6 Department of Energy is tackling the problem of  
7 long-term storage of nuclear waste because it is  
8 a horrible problem, and I consider your trying  
9 to come up with a solution on this a step in the  
10 right direction.

11 However, I feel that the current plan  
12 is flawed and I urge the DOE recommend the  
13 no-action option to the president for the  
14 following reasons:

2 15 No. 1. America's roads and rails are  
16 not reliable enough to bear this lethal load.  
17 We in Illinois remember the recent gastly rail  
18 wreck in Bourbonnais where two steel cars  
19 compacted to a few feet thick.

20 Two weeks ago I was on I-80 going out  
21 to Omaha and it was littered with overturned  
22 semi's from an ice storm that had killed four  
23 professional drivers and scattered their loads  
24 onto the highway. The system proposed requires  
1 perfection and we do not have it. There is

...2        2    weather, there is human error and there is  
             3    technical error.

3        4                    No. 2. Illinois would bear a  
             5    disproportionate share, perhaps as much as 75  
             6    percent of the transportation risk. Indeed all  
             7    routes west from all sites east pass through  
             8    Illinois via train or on I-80, I-57 or I-64.  
             9    Five casks per day on our pothole filled roads  
             10   for 24 years. No, thank you.

4        11                   No. 3. Both the containers and the  
             12   geologic site itself are flawed. More than 200  
             13   public interest organizations have criticized  
             14   the site as having disqualifying conditions.  
             15   And yet the plan rolls on obliviously. Is DOE  
             16   listening?

             17                   No. 4. There is no agreement from  
             18   several of the concerned parties, including the  
             19   host state itself, Nevada, and various tribal  
             20   nations affected, in particular the Western  
             21   Shoshone Nation, and it violates existing  
             22   treaties with them.

5        23                   No. 5. How can we be expected to  
             24   approve an evolving or iterating, as said today,  
             1   design? Congress has changed. Budgets get cut  
             2   and often it is that safety cushion that gets  
             3   cut first.

             4                   No. 6. O'Hare has made extraordinary  
             5   efforts to combat terrorism. I see enormous

6 possibilities for greater terrorism with all of  
7 the new risks being put on our highways and our  
8 rails. We must turn off the tap by shutting  
9 down our nuclear plants, because continued  
10 production and its waste by-products create  
11 unacceptable risks at every step of this  
12 process. Those utilities that produce it, and  
13 unfortunately those of us in Illinois are  
14 responsible for more of it than much of the  
15 nation, must find their own foolproof ways to  
16 safely store it locally, and at their own  
17 expense, not at the taxpayer's, or else stop  
18 producing it. Not send it away to someone  
19 else's back yard.

20 We know what we need to do. We need  
21 to put our vast resources, the greatest in the  
22 world at this time, as the only superpower, into  
23 conservation, recycling, cogeneration, solar and  
24 wind power. We must derail mobile Chernobyl  
1 before Illinois or some other state pays the  
2 tragic price. Thank you.